arXiv:1703.08936v1 [cs.LO] 27 Mar 2017

Timed Automata with Polynomial Delay and their Expressiveness

Valentin Bura and Tim French and Mark Reynolds

University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia
valentin.bura@research.uwa.edu.au

Abstract. We consider previous models of Timed, Probabilistic and Stochastic Timed Automata, we introduce our model of Timed Automata with Polynomial Delay and we characterize the expressiveness of these models relative to each other.

Timed and probabilistic automata may be used for modelling systems that exhibit timed and probabilistic behaviour as diverse as safety-critical navigation, web security, algorithmic trading, search-engine optimization, communication protocol design and hardware failure prediction. It is important to understand the expressiveness power of these models and incorporate them within an expressiveness hierarchy, as properties of given machines may be deduced upwards and downwards the hierarchy. There exists, for example, a trade-off between the expressiveness of a given model of computation and the tractability/decidability of its Model Checking problem. This paper provides a unifying expressiveness framework for the aforementioned models. We define measures on the runs of machines and understand two runs as *isomorphic* or *homomorphic* if one can be obtained from another by applying certain transformations. Two machines will then have the same expressiveness power if there exists a bijection between their collection of runs determined by these isomorphisms or homomorphisms. We also introduce our model of Timed Automata with Probabilistic Delay, a restriction of Stochastic Timed Automata to transitions characterized by Taylor Polynomials. Of interest to us is the paper *Thin and Thick Timed Regular Languages* by Basset and Asarin [2] in which information-theoretic arguments are applied for characterizing trajectories of timed automata.

Alur and Dill develop in [1] the theory of timed automata to model the behavior of real-time, safety-critical systems over time, with applications such as navigation, traffic signaling or railway safety. The definition provides a way to include timing information within state-transition machines using real-valued variables called clocks. Stoelinga in [9] provides an introduction to probabilistic automata, describing how distributed systems with discrete probabilities can be modeled and analyzed by means of this model and extending the basic techniques of analysis of non-probabilistic automata to probabilistic systems. Probabilistic timed automata are timed automata extended with discrete probability distributions, and can be used to model timed randomized protocols or fault-tolerant systems. They were introduced by Kwiatowska et al. in [7]. The authors use

probabilistic decision protocols to model real-time models exhibiting probabilistic behavior. Our brief exposition of Stochastic Timed Automata, a relatively new topic in the area, is an adaptation of the model introduced in [3]. A mathematical treatment of concurrent timed and probabilistic systems is given in the monograph [8] Stochastic Timed Automata and related results are considered in Baier et al. [3] and Hartmanns in [6] The theory of Stochastic Processes is given by Grimmett and Stirzaker in [5]

In the first section we explain the notation used and introduce Non-deterministic Finite-state Automata. In the second section we introduce adapted versions of Timed Automata, Probabilistic Automata, Probabilistic Timed Automata and Stochastic Timed Automata. In the third section we introduce our model of Timed Automata with Polynomial Delay. In the fourth section we set up the expressiveness framework that will apply to these models and outline our results. The fifth section deals with future work and conclusion. The technical appendices give details of the proofs of our main results.

1 Preliminaries

Let $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R}$ denote the natural, rational, real numbers with instances

$$\mathtt{n}_1, \mathtt{n}_2, \ldots, \mathtt{q}_1, \mathtt{q}_2, \ldots, \mathtt{x}_1, \mathtt{x}_2, \ldots$$

Special kinds of natural numbers are members of *index sets* $\mathtt{J}$ denoted by $\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{t}, \mathtt{i}, \mathtt{j}, \mathtt{m}, \mathtt{n}, \mathtt{r}$. In the present work, index sets are always subsets of $\mathbb{N}$. For a function $\mathtt{f}$ let $\mathtt{dom}(\mathtt{f})$ denote its domain and $\mathtt{cod}(\mathtt{f})$ its codomain. A *relabelling* is any bijective map φ. An *embedding* is any non-injective map φ. Sequences may be finite or countably infinite. A $\mathtt{k}$-tuple is a sequence of length $\mathtt{k}$. For a $\mathtt{k}$-tuple $\sigma = (s_1, s_2 \ldots s_\mathtt{k})$ let $\sigma(\mathtt{i}) = s_\mathtt{i}$. For any sequence σ, let $\sigma_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}$ be its initial segment of length $\mathtt{k}$. For any sequences σ, σ' write $\sigma \preceq \sigma'$ if σ is an initial segment of σ'. This induces a partial order on the collection of considered sequences. A collection $\mathcal{S}$ of sequences is called *prefix-free* if there exists no $\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\sigma \preceq \sigma'$. For any sequence $\sigma_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}$ let

$$\mathtt{head}(\sigma) = \sigma(1) \text{ and } \mathtt{tail}(\sigma) = \sigma(2) \ldots \sigma(\mathtt{k})$$

For any sequence $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \ldots \sigma_\mathtt{k}, \sigma_{\mathtt{k}+1} \ldots$ we let $\#, \sigma_2 \ldots \#, \sigma_{\mathtt{k}+1} \ldots$ and $\sigma_1, \# \ldots \sigma_\mathtt{k}, \# \ldots$ denote the sub-sequences $\sigma_{2\mathtt{k}}$ and $\sigma_{2\mathtt{k}+1}$. The padding characters indicate we obtain the information in the sub-sequences by *hiding* certain components of the initial sequence. For any finite set of positive integers $\mathcal{S}$ let $\mu\mathcal{S}$ and $\xi\mathcal{S}$ denote its minimum and maximum elements respectively. A time sequence τ is a rational-valued sequence $\tau_\mathtt{i}$, the "time values", that is monotonically increasing and non-convergent. A time-isomorphism is a bijective map

$$\varepsilon \colon \tau \to \tau' \text{ such that } \tau_\mathtt{i} \preceq \tau_\mathtt{j} \text{ iff } \varepsilon(\tau_\mathtt{i}) \preceq \varepsilon(\tau_\mathtt{j})$$

Σ is a finite list of symbols, the *alphabet*. We shall not impose a limit on the size of Σ, only stipulate that it must be finite. For the present purposes we

extend the automata considered with a collection Γ of "actions" γ, which are finite concatenations of symbols σ from an alphabet Σ; we hence have $\Gamma \subseteq \Sigma^*$. A *timed word* in this context is a sequence of pairs $\mathtt{w} = (\gamma, \tau)$, it can be viewed as an input stream that shows action $\gamma_\mathtt{i}$ at time $\tau_\mathtt{i}$. *Clocks* are variables over $\mathbb{R}_+$ gathered in collection $\mathtt{C}$. We distinguish between clocks $\mathtt{c}_1, \mathtt{c}_2 \ldots \mathtt{c}_\mathtt{m}$ and their real values $\mathtt{x}_1, \mathtt{x}_2 \ldots \mathtt{x}_\mathtt{m}$ as follows. A *clock interpretation* is a function $\iota \colon \mathtt{C}^\mathtt{m} \to \mathbb{R}_+^\mathtt{m}$. Whenever it is clear from context we write $\iota(\mathtt{c}_\mathtt{r})$ to denote the value $\iota(\bar{\mathtt{c}})(\mathtt{r})$. The collection of all clock interpretations is denoted by $\mathbb{R}_+^\mathtt{C}$. The collection $\mathtt{CON}$ of *clock constraints* $\mathtt{con}$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathtt{con} := \mathtt{x} < \mathtt{c}_1 \mid \mathtt{x} \leq \mathtt{c}_1 \mid \mathtt{c}_1 < \mathtt{x} \mid \mathtt{c}_1 \leq \mathtt{x} \mid \mathtt{x} + \mathtt{c}_1 \leq \mathtt{x}' + \mathtt{c}_2 \mid \mathtt{x} + \mathtt{c}_1 < \mathtt{x}' + \mathtt{c}_2 \mid \neg\mathtt{con} \mid \mathtt{con}' \vee \mathtt{con}''$$

where $\mathtt{x}, \mathtt{x}' \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathtt{c}_1, \mathtt{c}_2 \in \mathtt{C}$ and $\mathtt{con}, \mathtt{con}', \mathtt{con}''$ are clock constraints. Constraints will be assigned to transitions between states of machines endowed with clocks, in which case we write $\mathtt{con} \in \mathtt{CON}(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}')$ to denote that a transition between $\mathtt{s}$ and $\mathtt{s}'$ is associated with constraint $\mathtt{con}$. The clock interpretation ι *satisfies* the constraint $\mathtt{con}$, denoted as $\iota \rhd \mathtt{con}$ if and only if $\mathtt{con}$ resolves to a true inequality after substituting uniformly each clock variable $\mathtt{c}$ in $\mathtt{con}$ with the corresponding $\iota(\mathtt{c})$ from $\mathbb{R}_+^\mathtt{C}$. Bouyer et al. in [4] show timed automata with constraints involving two clocks (diagonal constraints) have the same expressive power as the classical model using constraints in which one clock is compared to a constant, though the algorithm that solves the reachability problem for machines with diagonal constraints is less efficient. We shall not apply our expressiveness measures to those two classes of timed automata due to the limited space available. Finite State Machines (automata) are models of computation based on a state/transition paradigm. We will sharply distinguish between "internal" and "external" changes in configuration of automata, corresponding to *runs* and respectively *traces*. It is customary with these models to use graphical representations in order to help the reader with further intuitions and we will seldom use those graphics in our formal arguments. Guards and/or probabilities or functions describing probability distributions may be assigned to edges and the notation $[\mathtt{c}]$ means the clock $\mathtt{c}$ is reset on a given edge. For the automata considered we will define the form of runs ψ, traces ϕ and transitions $\mathtt{e}$ and in general we will write $\mathtt{source}(\mathtt{e})$ and $\mathtt{target}(\mathtt{e})$ to denote the state of origin and the state of destination of a given transition, denote by $\mathtt{E}$ the collection of edges of a given machine and for any run ψ we let $\psi(\mathtt{i})$ denote the $\mathtt{i}$th edge in ψ.

In the following we let $(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma)$ be the State/Action triple, consisting of

- a finite set of states $\mathtt{S} = \{1, 2, \ldots \mathtt{k}\}$,
- a distinguished state $\mathtt{s}_1 \in \mathtt{S}$, the *start state* and
- a collection of actions Γ

Definition 1 (Non-determinstic Finite-state Automata). *An* automaton $\mathtt{N}$ *is a quadruple*

$$(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \delta)$$

where:

$(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma)$ *is the state/action triple, and*
$\delta \subset \mathtt{S} \times \Gamma \times \mathtt{S}$ *is a transition relation*

A run ψ of an NFA $\mathsf{N} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \delta)$ together with its corresponding trace ϕ are sequences of the form:

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1) \xrightarrow{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_2) \xrightarrow{\gamma_2} \dots \text{ and } \phi = (\#) \xrightarrow{\gamma_1} (\#) \xrightarrow{\gamma_2} \dots$$

where $(\mathtt{s}_i, \gamma_i, \mathtt{s}_{i+1}) \in \delta$ and let

$$\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}) \xrightarrow{\gamma_\mathtt{j}} (\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1})$$

Let Ψ_N and Φ_N be the collections of runs and traces of a given NFA N. Denote by NFA the collection of such machines.

2 Timed and Probabilistic Automata

Timed Automata are extensions of finite automata that incorporate timing information, allowing for modelling of systems whose behaviour depends on time. A timed automaton is depicted in Figure 1.

Definition 2 (Timed Automata). *A* timed automaton T *is a quintuple*

$$(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \delta)$$

where:

$(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma)$ *is the state/action triple, and*
$\mathtt{C} = \{\mathtt{c}_1, \mathtt{c}_2, \dots \mathtt{c}_\mathtt{m}\}$ *is a finite collection of variables called* clocks,
$\delta \subset \mathtt{S} \times 2^\mathtt{C} \times \mathtt{CON} \times \Gamma \times \mathtt{S}$ *is the* transition relation.



Fig. 1. Timed Automaton(left) and Probabilistic Automaton(right)

A *run* ψ associated with a timed automaton $\mathsf{T} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \delta)$ over a timed word $\mathtt{w} = (\gamma, \tau)$ with $\gamma \in \Gamma$ together with the corresponding *trace* ϕ are sequences of the form

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \iota_1, \mathtt{R}_1) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_2, \iota_2, \mathtt{R}_2) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \dots \text{ and } \phi = (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \dots$$

where each $\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{i}$ is a state, $\iota_\mathtt{i}$ is a *clock interpretation* and the transition happens "within time $\tau_\mathtt{i}$", such that $\mathtt{s}_1$ is the start state and $\iota_1(\mathtt{c}) = 0$ and $\mathtt{R}_1 = \emptyset$ for all clocks $\mathtt{c}$, and for all i there is an edge specified by δ from $\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{i}$ to $\mathtt{s}_{i+1}$ such that $\iota_\mathtt{k} \rhd \mathtt{con}$ where $\mathtt{con} \in \mathtt{CON}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1})$. Let $\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \iota_\mathtt{j})$, let $\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}$ be the initial segment of ψ that ends with $(\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}, \iota_{\mathtt{k}+1})$ and let

$$\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \iota_\mathtt{j}) \xrightarrow[\tau_\mathtt{j}]{\gamma_\mathtt{j}} (\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \iota_{\mathtt{j}+1})$$

Note that one obtains ϕ from ψ by replacing all the pairs $(\mathtt{s}, \iota)$ with padding characters. For any run ψ we let $\mathtt{S}(\psi)$, $\Gamma(\psi)$, $\mathtt{T}(\psi)$ denote the sequences of states, actions and time instances in ψ, for any trace ϕ we let $\Gamma(\phi)$ and $\mathtt{T}(\phi)$ denote the sequences of actions and time instances in ϕ. Let Ψ_T and Φ_T denote the collection of all runs and traces of a given T. Denote by $\mathtt{TIMED}$ the collection of timed automata.

A probabilistic automaton, depicted in Figure 1, has the target of a transition a probabilistic choice over several states. This model is summarized by Stoelinga in [9] and uses discrete probabilistic choice and non-deterministic choice which makes it suitable for modelling randomized distributed algorithms, probabilistic communication protocols and systems with failing components.

Definition 3 (Probabilistic Automata).
A probabilistic automaton P *is a quintuple*

$$(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{distr}, \delta)$$

where:

$(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma)$ *is the state/action triple, and*
$\mathtt{distr}$ *is a discrete probability distribution assigned to pairs of states,*
$\delta \subseteq \mathtt{S} \times \mathtt{S} \times \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{S} \times \mathtt{S}) \times \Gamma$ *is the probabilistic transition relation with* $\mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}') \in [0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$ *for any* $\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}' \in \mathtt{S}$.

A *run* ψ of a probabilistic automaton P is a sequence of states and edge probabilities while the corresponding *trace* ϕ is a sequence of actions

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{s}_2)) \xrightarrow{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_2, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_2, \mathtt{s}_3)) \xrightarrow{\gamma_2} \dots \text{ and } \phi = (\#, \#) \xrightarrow{\gamma_1} (\#, \#) \xrightarrow{\gamma_2} \dots$$

such that $\mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}) > 0$ for all $\mathtt{k}$. Let $\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}))$, let $\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}$ be the initial segment of ψ that ends with $(\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+2}))$ and let

$$\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1})) \xrightarrow[\tau_\mathtt{j}]{\gamma_\mathtt{j}} (\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+2}))$$



Fig. 2. Probabilistic Timed Automaton (left) and Timed Automaton with Polynomial Delay (right)

Denote by Ψ_{P} the collection of runs and by Φ_{P} the collection of traces of a given machine P. Denote by $\mathtt{PROB}$ the collection of extended probabilistic automata.

Kwiatkowska et al. define probabilistic timed automata in [7] building on discrete-time Markov chains. A probabilistic timed automaton is depicted in Figure 2.

Definition 4 (Probabilistic Timed Automata). *A* probabilistic timed automaton A *is a pentuple*

$$(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \mathtt{prob})$$

where

$(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma)$ *is the state/action triple, and*
$\mathtt{C} = \{\mathtt{c}_1, \mathtt{c}_2, \ldots \mathtt{c}_\mathtt{m}\}$ *is a finite collection of* clocks*,*
$\mathtt{prob} \subseteq \mathtt{S} \times \mathtt{S} \times \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{S} \times \mathtt{S}) \times \Gamma \times \mathtt{CON} \times \mathtt{R}$ *is the probabilistic transition relation with* $\mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}') \in [0,1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$ *for any* $\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}' \in \mathtt{S}$.

A *run* ψ of a probabilistic timed automaton A and the corresponding *trace* ϕ are sequences of the form

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{s}_2), \iota_1, \mathtt{R}_1) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_2, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_2, \mathtt{s}_3), \iota_2, \mathtt{R}_2) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \ldots \text{ and}$$
$$\phi = (\#, \#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\#, \#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \ldots$$

such that $\mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}) > 0$ for all $\mathtt{k}$, $\iota_1(\mathtt{c}) = 0$, $\mathtt{R}_1 = \emptyset$ and $\iota_\mathtt{k} \rhd \mathtt{con}$ where $\mathtt{CON}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}) = \mathtt{con}$. Let $\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}), \iota_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{R}_\mathtt{j})$, let $\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}$ be the initial segment of ψ that ends with $(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}), \iota_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{R}_\mathtt{k})$ and let

$$\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}), \iota_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{R}_\mathtt{j}) \xrightarrow[\tau_\mathtt{j}]{\gamma_\mathtt{j}} (\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+2}), \iota_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \mathtt{R}_{\mathtt{j}+1})$$

Denote by Ψ_{A} the collection of runs and Φ_{A} the collection of traces of a given A. Denote by PROBTIMED the collection of extended probabilistic timed automata.

Definition 5 (Stochastic Timed Automata). *A* stochastic timed automaton S *is a sixtuple*

$$(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \mathtt{F}, \Delta)$$

where:

$(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma)$ *is the state/action triple, and*
$\mathtt{C}$ *is a finite collection of variables* $\mathtt{c}_1, \mathtt{c}_2 \cdots \mathtt{c}_{\mathtt{m}}$ *called* clocks *such that for each triple* $(\mathtt{i}, \mathtt{j}, \mathtt{r}) \in \mathtt{S} \times \mathtt{S} \times \{1 \dots \mathtt{m}\}$ *we have* $\mathtt{dom}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}(\mathtt{c}_{\mathtt{r}}) = (\mathtt{q}_1, \mathtt{q}_2)$ *for* $0 \leq \mathtt{q}_1 < \mathtt{q}_2 \leq 1$,
$\mathtt{F}$ *is a finite family of integrable functions of* $\mathtt{m}$ *variables* $\mathtt{f}^1_1, \mathtt{f}^1_2 \dots \mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{k}}$ *with*

$$\mathtt{dom}(\mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}) = \prod_{\mathtt{r}=1}^{\mathtt{m}} \mathtt{dom}(\mathtt{c}_{\mathtt{r}})$$

Δ *is a finite family of functions* $\delta^1_1, \delta^1_2 \dots \delta^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{k}}$ *such that* $\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}} \colon [0,1]^{\mathtt{m}} \to (0,1) \times \Gamma$, *such that*

$$\mathtt{dom}(\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}) = \mathtt{dom}(\mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}) \text{ and } \mathtt{cod}(\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}) = \mathtt{P}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}$$

with each $\mathtt{P}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}$ *specifying the probability of moving from state* $\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{i}}$ *to state* $\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}}$ *by*

$$\mathtt{P}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}} = \frac{|\mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}|}{\sum_{\mathtt{k}=1}^{\mathtt{m}} |\mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{k}}|} \in [0,1]$$

A *run* of a stochastic timed automaton S together with the corresponding *trace* are the sequences

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{f}^1_2, \iota_1) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_2, \mathtt{f}^2_3, \iota_2) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \dots \text{ and } \phi = (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \dots$$

such that $\mu(\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}}, \iota) > 0$ for all $\mathtt{k}$, $\iota_1(\mathtt{c}) = 0$, with $\iota_{\mathtt{k}} \in \mathtt{dom}(\mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{k}+1})$. Let $\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}}, \mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{j}}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \iota_{\mathtt{j}}, \mathtt{R}_{\mathtt{j}})$, let $\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}$ be the initial segment of ψ that ends with $(\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}}, \mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{k}+1}, \iota_{\mathtt{k}}, \mathtt{R}_{\mathtt{k}})$ and let

$$\mathtt{e}_{\psi}(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}}, \mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{j}}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \iota_{\mathtt{j}}) \xrightarrow[\tau_{\mathtt{j}}]{\gamma_{\mathtt{j}}} (\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{j}+1}_{\mathtt{j}+2}, \iota_{\mathtt{j}+1})$$

Denote by Ψ_{S} the collection of runs and Φ_{S} the collection of traces of a given S. Denote by STOCTIMED the collection of Stochastic Timed Automata.

3 Polynomial Delay

For any function $\mathtt{f}$ of $\mathtt{n}$ variables, let its Taylor polynomial of degree Π be ${}_{\Pi}\mathcal{T}(\mathtt{f}(\mathtt{x}_1, \cdots, \mathtt{x}_{\mathtt{n}}))$. Timed Automata with Polynomial Delay are a restriction of Stochastic Timed Automata to transitions described by functions expressible by Taylor polynomials only. The motivation for introducing this model is to allow a digital representation for the functions determining the machine transitions. A timed automaton with polynomial delay is pictured in Figure 2.

Definition 6 (Timed Automata with Polynomial Delay).
A timed automaton with polynomial delay D *is a septuple*

$$(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \mathtt{F}, \Delta, \Pi)$$

where:

$(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma)$ *is the state/action triple, and*
$\mathtt{C}$ *is a finite collection of variables* $\mathtt{c}_1, \mathtt{c}_2 \cdots \mathtt{c}_\mathtt{m}$ *called* clocks *such that for each triple* $(\mathtt{i}, \mathtt{j}, \mathtt{r}) \in \mathtt{S} \times \mathtt{S} \times \{1 \dots \mathtt{m}\}$ *we have* $\mathtt{dom}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}(\mathtt{c}_\mathtt{r}) = (\mathtt{q}_1, \mathtt{q}_2)$ *for* $0 \leq \mathtt{q}_1 < \mathtt{q}_2 \leq 1$,
$\mathtt{F}$ *is a finite family of differentiable functions of* $\mathtt{m}$ *variables* $\mathtt{f}^1_1, \mathtt{f}^1_2 \dots \mathtt{f}^\mathtt{k}_\mathtt{k}$ *with*

$$\mathtt{dom}(\mathtt{f}^\mathtt{i}_\mathtt{j}) = \prod_{\mathtt{r}=1}^{\mathtt{m}} \mathtt{dom}(\mathtt{c}_\mathtt{r})$$

Δ *is a finite family of functions* $\delta^1_1, \delta^1_2 \dots \delta^m_m$ *such that* $\delta^\mathtt{i}_\mathtt{j} \colon [0,1]^\mathtt{m} \to (0,1) \times \Gamma$, *such that*

$$\mathtt{dom}(\delta^\mathtt{i}_\mathtt{j}) = \mathtt{dom}(\mathtt{f}^\mathtt{i}_\mathtt{j}) \text{ and } \mathtt{cod}(\delta^\mathtt{i}_\mathtt{j}) = \mathtt{P}^\mathtt{i}_\mathtt{j}$$

with each $\mathtt{P}^\mathtt{i}_\mathtt{j}$ *specifying the probability of moving from state* $\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{i}$ *to state* $\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}$ *by*

$$\mathtt{P}^\mathtt{i}_\mathtt{j} = \frac{|_\Pi \mathcal{T}^\mathtt{i}_\mathtt{j}|}{\sum_{\mathtt{k}=1}^{\mathtt{m}} |_\Pi \mathcal{T}^\mathtt{i}_\mathtt{k}|} \in [0,1]$$

where ${}_\Pi\mathcal{T}^\mathtt{i}_\mathtt{j}$ *is the Taylor polynomial of* $\mathtt{f}^\mathtt{i}_\mathtt{j}$ *of degree* Π

A *run* ψ associated with a timed automaton with polynomial delay D together with the corresponding *trace* ϕ are sequences of the form

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \delta^1_2, \iota_1) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_2, \delta^2_3, \iota_2) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \dots \text{ and } \phi = (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \dots$$

where each $\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{i}$ is a state, $\iota_\mathtt{i}$ is a *clock interpretation*, $\iota_1(\mathtt{c}) = 0$, and the transition happens "within time $\tau_\mathtt{i}$" and for all $\mathtt{i}$ there is an edge $\delta^\mathtt{i}_{\mathtt{i}+1} \in \Delta$ with $\iota_{\mathtt{i}+1} \in \mathtt{dom}(\delta^\mathtt{i}_{\mathtt{i}+1})$ and $\mathtt{P}^\mathtt{i}_{\mathtt{i}+1}(\iota_\mathtt{i}) > 0$.

Let $\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \delta^\mathtt{j}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \iota_\mathtt{j})$, let $\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}$ be the initial segment of ψ that ends with $(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \delta^\mathtt{k}_{\mathtt{k}+1}, \iota_\mathtt{k})$ and let $\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \delta^\mathtt{j}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \iota_\mathtt{j}) \xrightarrow[\tau_\mathtt{j}]{\gamma_\mathtt{j}} (\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \delta^{\mathtt{j}+1}_{\mathtt{j}+2}, \iota_{\mathtt{j}+1})$. Denote by Ψ_D the collection of runs of a given timed automaton with polynomial delay D. Note again that one obtains ϕ from ψ by replacing all the pairs $(\mathtt{s}, \iota)$ with padding characters. Let Φ_D denote the collection of traces of a given D and let Ψ_D denote the collection of runs of a given D. Denote by $\mathtt{DELAY}$ the collection of timed automata with polynomial delay.

We note the domain of each transition encodes resets, guards and invariants as classically understood in the literature, considering that state invariants may be "pushed" on the guards and global and local bounds on the clocks may be computed effectively:

- a constant C_{T} can be computed for any timed automaton T such that for all constraints $\mathtt{con}$, either $\mathtt{x} \rhd \mathtt{con}$ for all $\mathtt{x} \in \mathbb{R}$ or, if $\iota \rhd \mathtt{con}$ then $\iota < C_{\mathsf{T}}$
- $\mathtt{dom}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}(\mathtt{c_r})$ is bounded above by 1 which effectively means we let ι/C_{T} be in $\mathtt{dom}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}(\mathtt{c_r})$ if $C_{\mathsf{T}} > \iota$ or else we map $\iota \mapsto 1$
- $\mu\mathtt{dom}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}(\mathtt{c_r}) = 0$ is equivalent to $\mathtt{c_r}$ being reset on an edge $\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}$, otherwise $\mu\mathtt{dom}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}(\mathtt{c_r})$ is the lower bound on $\mathtt{c_r}$ for edge $(\mathtt{i}, \mathtt{j})$ generated by guards and invariants, while
- $\xi\mathtt{dom}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}(\mathtt{c_r})$ is the upper bound on $\mathtt{c_r}$ for edge $(\mathtt{i}, \mathtt{j})$ generated by guards and invariants

4 Expressiveness

One obtains a measure on the runs of non-probabilistic automata from a weighting map $\mathtt{W}\colon \mathtt{E} \to [0,1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$ assigning weights $\mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e})$ to edges subject to

$$\sum_{\forall \mathtt{j} \forall \psi} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j})) = 1$$

and defining

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}) = \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}) \text{ and } \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}, \mathtt{e}') = \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}) \times \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}') \text{ and}$$
$$\mathcal{H}(\psi_{\lfloor}\mathtt{k}) = \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{head}(\psi_{\lfloor}\mathtt{k})) \times \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{tail}(\psi_{\lfloor}\mathtt{k}))$$

We may now present the measure of runs for the machines defined above.

Definition 7 (NFA Run Measure). *We assign* $\mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e})$ *to transitions of the form* $(\mathtt{s}) \xrightarrow[\tau]{\gamma} (\mathtt{s}')$ *under the constraints* $\sum_{\forall \mathtt{j} \forall \psi} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j})) = 1$ *and for all* s', s'' *such that there exists edges* $\mathtt{e} = (\mathtt{s}) \xrightarrow[\tau]{\gamma} (\mathtt{s}')$ *and* $\mathtt{e}' = (\mathtt{s}) \xrightarrow[\tau]{\gamma} (\mathtt{s}'')$ *we let* $\mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}) = \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}')$. *Define* $\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}) = \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e})$, $\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}, \mathtt{e}') = \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}) \times \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}')$ *and for any finite run* ψ *define* $\mathcal{H}(\psi) = \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{head}(\psi)) \times \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{tail}(\psi))$

The definition of a measure on the run of a Timed Automaton is essentially the same.

Definition 8 (TA Run Measure). *We assign* $\mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e})$ *to transitions of the form* $\mathtt{e} = (\mathtt{s}, \iota, \mathtt{R}) \xrightarrow[\tau]{\gamma} (\mathtt{s}', \iota', \mathtt{R}')$ *under the constraints* $\sum_{\forall \mathtt{j} \forall \psi} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j})) = 1$ *and for all* s', s'' *such that there exists edges* $\mathtt{e} = (\mathtt{s}, \iota, \mathtt{R}) \xrightarrow[\tau]{\gamma} (\mathtt{s}', \iota', \mathtt{R}')$ *and* $\mathtt{e}' = (\mathtt{s}, \iota, \mathtt{R}) \xrightarrow[\tau]{\gamma} (\mathtt{s}'', \iota'', \mathtt{R}'')$ *we let* $\mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}) = \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}')$. *Define the measure of a run by* $\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}) = \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e})$, $\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}, \mathtt{e}') = \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}) \times \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}')$ *and for any finite* ψ *define* $\mathcal{H}(\psi) = \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{head}(\psi)) \times \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{tail}(\psi))$

In defining the measure on the runs of probabilistic machines we will take advantage of the probabilities assigned to edges.

Definition 9 (PA Run Measure). *Let $\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}$ be a finite fragment of a run of a probabilistic automaton with*

$$\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}} = (\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{s}_2)) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_2, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_2, \mathtt{s}_3)) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \ldots (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}))$$

define the measure of ψ as follows:

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j})) = \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}) \text{ and}$$
$$\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j}), \mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j}+1)) = \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}) \times \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+2}) \text{ and}$$
$$\mathcal{H}(\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}) = \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{head}(\psi)) \times \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{tail}(\psi))$$

A measure on a PTA run is essentially the same.

Definition 10 (PTA Run Measure). *Let $\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}$ be a finite fragment of a run of a probabilistic timed automaton with*

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{s}_2), \iota_1, \mathtt{R}_1) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} \ldots (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}), \iota_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{R}_\mathtt{k})$$

define the measure of ψ as follows:

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j})) = \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}) \text{ and}$$
$$\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j}), \mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j}+1)) = \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}) \times \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+2}) \text{ and}$$
$$\mathcal{H}(\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}) = \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{head}(\psi)) \times \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{tail}(\psi))$$

Measures on TAPD and STA runs must take into account the function of time that determines a transition.

Definition 11 (TAPD Run Measure). *Let ψ be a finite run of a timed automaton with polynomial delay with*

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \delta^1_2, \iota_1) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_2, \delta^2_3, \iota_2) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \ldots (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \delta^\mathtt{k}_{\mathtt{k}+1}, \iota_\mathtt{k})$$

define the measure of ψ as follows:

$$\mathcal{H}(\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}) = \int_{\bigcap \mathtt{dom}(\delta^\mathtt{i}_{\mathtt{i}+1})} \prod_{\mathtt{i}=1}^{\mathtt{k}} (\mathtt{P}^\mathtt{i}_{\mathtt{i}+1}(\bar{\mathtt{c}})) d\bar{\mathtt{c}}$$

Definition 12 (STA Run Measure). *Let ψ be a finite run of a stochastic timed automaton with*

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{f}^1_2, \iota_1) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_2, \mathtt{f}^2_3, \iota_2) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \ldots (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{f}^\mathtt{k}_{\mathtt{k}+1}, \iota_\mathtt{k})$$

define the measure of ψ as follows:

$$\mathcal{H}(\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}) = \int_{\bigcap \mathtt{dom}(\mathtt{f}^\mathtt{i}_{\mathtt{i}+1})} \prod_{\mathtt{i}=1}^{\mathtt{k}} (\mathtt{f}^\mathtt{i}_{\mathtt{i}+1}(\bar{\mathtt{c}})) d\bar{\mathtt{c}}$$

The following result shows our measures are well-defined.

Proposition 1. *For any run ψ, the measure $\mathcal{H}$ on ψ is finite and we have $\mathcal{H}(\psi) < 1$*

Proof. If ψ belongs to an NFA, TA, PA or PTA we have $\mathtt{w}_1 \times \mathtt{w}_2 \times \cdots \times \mathtt{w}_\mathtt{k} < 1$ since $\mathtt{w}_\mathtt{i} < 1$ for all $\mathtt{i}$. If ψ belongs to an STA or TAPD, we have $\mathtt{q} < 1$ for any $\mathtt{q} \in \mathtt{dom}(\mathtt{f}_\mathtt{i})$ and $\mathtt{q}' < 1$ for any $\mathtt{q}' \in \mathtt{cod}(\mathtt{f}_\mathtt{i})$.

We introduce the measure $\mathcal{L}$ on collections of runs. We require the collections to be prefix-free in order to avoid redundancies in representation.

Definition 13 (Measure on Runs). *For any prefix-free collection of runs Ψ' of a given NFA, TA, PA, PTA, TAPD or STA, let the measure $\mathcal{L}$ on the runs of Ψ' be*

$$\mathcal{L}(\Psi') = \sum_{\psi \in \Psi'} \mathcal{H}(\psi)$$

The following result shows the measure $\mathcal{L}$ is well-defined.

Proposition 2. *For any prefix-free collection of runs Ψ' of a fixed machine, we have $\mathcal{L}(\Psi') < 1$*

Proof. **Claim:** for any pair of runs ψ, ψ' there exists a run ψ'' such that $\psi'' \preceq \psi$ and $\psi'' \preceq \psi'$. This is immediate since ψ'' may be empty, and the claim induces a partial order on the runs of any machine, hence any collection of runs may be viewed as a finitely branching tree.

Claim: for any pair of runs ψ, ψ', if $\psi \preceq \psi'$ then $\mathcal{H}(\psi) \geq \mathcal{H}(\psi')$. This is provable by induction on the length of runs. We show this for a timed automaton $\mathtt{T}$, the other proofs should be analogous. Let $\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \iota_1, \mathtt{R}_1) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_2, \iota_2, \mathtt{R}_2) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \ldots$ and consider any finite segment of this run ψ'. We have $\mathcal{H}(\psi) = \prod_{\mathtt{i}=1}^{|\psi|} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{i}))$ and $\mathcal{H}(\psi') = \prod_{\mathtt{i}=1}^{|\psi'|} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi'}(\mathtt{i}))$. Since $|\psi'| \leq |\psi|$ and each weight $\mathtt{w} < 1$ the claim follows.

We are now concerned with sums of the form $S_\mathtt{k} = \mathtt{x}_1 + \mathtt{x}_2 + \cdots + \mathtt{x}_\mathtt{k}$ where $\mathtt{x}_\mathtt{i}$ represents the measure of run $\psi_\mathtt{i}$.

From the first claim, this is $\mathcal{H}(\hat{\psi}) \times (\mathtt{x} + \mathtt{x}') \geq 1$ where $\mathtt{x} = \prod_{\mathtt{r}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{|\psi_\mathtt{k}|} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_\mathtt{k}}(\mathtt{r}))$ and $\mathtt{x}' = (\mathtt{x}_1 + \mathtt{x}_2 + \cdots + \mathtt{x}_{\mathtt{k}-1})/\mathcal{H}(\hat{\psi})$ and by the first claim we may choose $\hat{\psi}$ to be the biggest common initial segment of $\psi_\mathtt{i}$ for $1 \leq \mathtt{i} \leq \mathtt{k}+1$. It suffices to show that $\mathtt{x} + \mathtt{x}' < 1$. We thus have

$$\mathtt{x}+\mathtt{x}' = \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{|\psi_1|} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_1}(\mathtt{j})) + \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{|\psi_2|} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_2}(\mathtt{j})) + \cdots + \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{|\psi_{\mathtt{k}-1}|} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_{\mathtt{k}-1}}(\mathtt{j})) + \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{|\psi_\mathtt{k}|} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_\mathtt{k}}(\mathtt{j}))$$

and we may assume wlog $|\psi_1| = |\psi_2| = \cdots = |\psi_{\mathtt{k}-1}| = |\psi_{\mathtt{k}}| = \mathtt{t}$ so we have

$$\mathtt{x}+\mathtt{x}' = \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_1}(\mathtt{j})) + \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_2}(\mathtt{j})) + \cdots + \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_{\mathtt{k}-1}}(\mathtt{j})) + \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_{\mathtt{k}}}(\mathtt{j}))$$

We show by induction on $\mathtt{t}$ that $\mathtt{x} + \mathtt{x}' < 1$, in the case of a timed automaton T. If $\mathtt{t} = 1$ we have $\mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_1}(1)) + \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_2}(1)) + \ldots \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_{\mathtt{k}}}(1)) < 1$ since for any edges $\mathtt{e}_{\psi_{\mathtt{i}}}(1)$ and $\mathtt{e}_{\psi_{\mathtt{j}}}(1)$ we must have $\mathtt{source}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_{\mathtt{i}}}(1)) = \mathtt{source}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_{\mathtt{j}}}(1))$. Suppose the statement holds for some $\mathtt{t}$ so we have

$$\prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_1}(\mathtt{j})) + \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_2}(\mathtt{j})) + \cdots + \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_{\mathtt{k}-1}}(\mathtt{j})) + \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_{\mathtt{k}}}(\mathtt{j})) < 1$$

consider the case of $\mathtt{t}+1$, which is:

$$\mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_1}(\mathtt{t}+1)) \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_1}(\mathtt{j})) + \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_2}(\mathtt{t}+1)) \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_2}(\mathtt{j})) + \ldots$$
$$+\mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_{\mathtt{k}-1}}(\mathtt{t}+1)) \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_{\mathtt{k}-1}}(\mathtt{j})) + \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_{\mathtt{k}}}(\mathtt{t}+1)) \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_{\mathtt{k}}}(\mathtt{j}))$$

By the second claim each term in this sum of the form $\mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_{\mathtt{r}}}(\mathtt{t}+1)) \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_{\mathtt{r}}}(\mathtt{j}))$ must be less than the term $\prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\psi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi_{\mathtt{r}}}(\mathtt{j}))$, which proves the inductive step.

Let ψ, ψ' be runs containing timing information. We consider them isomorphic and write $\psi \cong \psi'$ if there exist maps $\varphi\colon \mathtt{S}(\psi) \to \mathtt{S}(\psi')$, $\varepsilon\colon \mathtt{T}(\psi) \to \mathtt{T}(\psi')$ and $\vartheta\colon \Gamma(\psi) \to \Gamma(\psi')$ such that, for all $\mathtt{k}$, φ is a relabelling, ε is a time-isomorphism, ϑ is a relabelling and for all $\mathtt{i} \leq \mathtt{k}$

$$\varphi(\mathtt{S}(\psi(\mathtt{i}))) = \varphi(\mathtt{S}(\psi'(\mathtt{i}))) \text{ and } \varepsilon(\mathtt{T}(\psi(\mathtt{i}))) = \varepsilon(\mathtt{T}(\mathtt{S}(\psi'(\mathtt{i}))))$$

$$\text{and } \vartheta(\Gamma(\psi(\mathtt{i}))) = \vartheta(\Gamma(\mathtt{S}(\psi'(\mathtt{i}))))$$

with $\mathcal{H}(\psi) = \mathcal{H}(\psi')$.

Alternatively, if one of ψ, ψ' does not contain timing information, we will only require the relabelling on states and the relabelling on actions: $\varphi\colon \mathtt{S}(\psi) \to \mathtt{S}(\psi')$ and $\vartheta\colon \Gamma(\psi) \to \Gamma(\psi')$ such that, for all $\mathtt{k}$, φ is a relabelling, ϑ is a relabelling and for all $\mathtt{i} \leq \mathtt{k}$

$$\varphi(\mathtt{S}(\psi(\mathtt{i}))) = \varphi(\mathtt{S}(\psi'(\mathtt{i}))) \text{ and } \vartheta(\Gamma(\psi(\mathtt{i}))) = \vartheta(\Gamma(\mathtt{S}(\psi'(\mathtt{i})))) \text{ with } \mathcal{H}(\psi) = \mathcal{H}(\psi')$$

Isomorphic expressiveness is then a relation between machines with isomorphic runs.

Definition 14 (Isomorphic Expressiveness).

For two collections of runs Ψ and Ψ', let them be expressively isomorphic, $\Psi \cong \Psi'$, if there exists a bijection $\alpha\colon \Psi \to \Psi'$, relabellings φ, ϑ and a time-isomorphism ε such that $\psi \cong \alpha(\psi)$ with $\mathtt{S}(\psi) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathtt{S}(\alpha(\psi))$, $\mathtt{T}(\psi) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathtt{T}(\alpha(\psi))$ and $\Gamma(\psi) \xrightarrow{\vartheta} \Gamma(\alpha(\psi))$, or if one of Ψ, Ψ' does not contain runs with timing information, $\psi \cong \alpha(\psi)$ with $\mathtt{S}(\psi) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathtt{S}(\alpha(\psi))$, and $\Gamma(\psi) \xrightarrow{\vartheta} \Gamma(\alpha(\psi))$ as in Figure 5. We say machine M expresses machine M' and write $M \cong M'$ if $\Psi_M \cong \Psi_{M'}$ and for every $\hat{\Psi} \subset \Psi_M$, $\hat{\Psi}' \subset \Psi_{M'}$ if $\hat{\Psi} \cong \hat{\Psi}'$ then $\mathcal{L}(\hat{\Psi}) = \mathcal{L}(\hat{\Psi}')$. A collection of machines $\mathcal{S}$ expresses *a collection of machines $\mathcal{S}'$ and write $\mathcal{S}' \sqsubseteq_{\mathtt{iso}} \mathcal{S}$ if for every $M' \in \mathcal{S}'$ there exists $M \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $M \cong M'$. Write $\mathcal{S}' \sqsubset_{\mathtt{iso}} \mathcal{S}$ if the inclusion is strict.*

We now apply isomorphic expressiveness to each type of machine considered in this paper.

Theorem 1. *We observe the following strict inclusions*

- $\mathtt{NFA} \sqsubset_{\mathtt{iso}} \mathtt{TIMED}$
- $\mathtt{NFA} \sqsubset_{\mathtt{iso}} \mathtt{PROB}$
- $\mathtt{TIMED} \sqsubset_{\mathtt{iso}} \mathtt{PROBTIMED}$
- $\mathtt{PROB} \sqsubset_{\mathtt{iso}} \mathtt{PROBTIMED}$
- $\mathtt{PROBTIMED} \sqsubset_{\mathtt{iso}} \mathtt{DELAY}$
- $\mathtt{DELAY} \sqsubset_{\mathtt{iso}} \mathtt{STOCTIMED}$



Fig. 3. Theorem 1 - Isomorphic Expressiveness

Let ψ, ψ' be runs containing timing information. We consider them homomorphic and write $\psi \sim \psi'$ if there exist maps $\varphi\colon \mathtt{S}(\psi') \to \mathtt{S}(\psi)$, $\varepsilon\colon \mathtt{T}(\psi) \to \mathtt{T}(\psi')$ and $\vartheta\colon \Gamma(\psi) \to \Gamma(\psi')$ such that, for all $\mathtt{k}$, φ is an embedding, ε is a time-isomorphism, ϑ is a relabelling and for all $\mathtt{i} \leq \mathtt{k}$

$$\varphi(\mathtt{S}(\psi(\mathtt{i}))) = \varphi(\mathtt{S}(\psi'(\mathtt{i}))) \text{ and } \varepsilon(\mathtt{T}(\psi(\mathtt{i}))) = \varepsilon(\mathtt{T}(\mathtt{S}(\psi'(\mathtt{i}))))$$
$$\text{and } \vartheta(\Gamma(\psi(\mathtt{i}))) = \vartheta(\Gamma(\psi'(\mathtt{i})))$$

with $\mathcal{H}(\psi) = \mathcal{H}(\psi')$.

Alternatively, if one of ψ, ψ' does not contain timing information, we will only require the embedding on states and the relabelling on actions: $\varphi\colon \mathtt{S}(\psi') \to \mathtt{S}(\psi)$ and $\vartheta\colon \Gamma(\psi) \to \Gamma(\psi')$ such that, for all $\mathtt{k}$, φ is an embedding, ϑ is a relabelling and for all $\mathtt{i} \leq \mathtt{k}$

$$\varphi(\mathtt{S}(\psi(\mathtt{i}))) = \varphi(\mathtt{S}(\psi'(\mathtt{i}))) \text{ and } \vartheta(\Gamma(\psi(\mathtt{i}))) = \vartheta(\Gamma(\psi'(\mathtt{i}))) \text{ with } \mathcal{H}(\psi) = \mathcal{H}(\psi')$$

Homomorphic expressiveness is weaker measure of expressiveness.

Definition 15 (Homomorphic Expressiveness).

For two collections of runs Ψ and Ψ', let them be expressively homomorphic, $\Psi \sim \Psi'$, if there exists a bijection $\alpha\colon \Psi \to \Psi'$ such that $\psi \sim \alpha(\psi)$, and embedding φ, relabelling ϑ and a time-isomorphism ε such that $\psi \sim \alpha(\psi)$ with $\mathtt{S}(\psi) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathtt{S}(\alpha(\psi))$, $\mathtt{T}(\psi) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathtt{T}(\alpha(\psi))$ and $\Gamma(\psi) \xrightarrow{\vartheta} \Gamma(\alpha(\psi))$, or if one of Ψ, Ψ' does not contain runs with timing information, $\psi \sim \alpha(\psi)$ with $\mathtt{S}(\psi) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathtt{S}(\alpha(\psi))$, and $\Gamma(\psi) \xrightarrow{\vartheta} \Gamma(\alpha(\psi))$, as in Figure 5. We say machine M expresses machine M' and write $M \sim M'$ if $\Psi_M \sim \Psi_{M'}$. A collection of machines $\mathcal{S}$ expresses *a collection of machines $\mathcal{S}'$ and write $\mathcal{S}' \sqsubseteq_{\mathtt{hom}} \mathcal{S}$ if for every $M' \in \mathcal{S}'$ there exists $M \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $M \sim M'$. Write $\mathcal{S}' \sqsubset_{\mathtt{hom}} \mathcal{S}$ if the inclusion is strict. Write $\mathcal{S}' =_{\mathtt{hom}} \mathcal{S}$ if $\mathcal{S}' \sqsubset_{\mathtt{hom}} \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S} \sqsubset_{\mathtt{hom}} \mathcal{S}'$.*

Theorem 2. *We observe the following equalities and strict inclusions*

- $\mathtt{NFA} =_{\mathtt{hom}} \mathtt{TIMED}$
- -- $\mathtt{NFA} =_{\mathtt{hom}} \mathtt{PROB}$
- - $\mathtt{TIMED} =_{\mathtt{hom}} \mathtt{PROBTIMED}$
- - $\mathtt{PROB} =_{\mathtt{hom}} \mathtt{PROBTIMED}$
- - $\mathtt{PROBTIMED} \sqsubset_{\mathtt{hom}} \mathtt{DELAY}$
- - $\mathtt{DELAY} \sqsubset_{\mathtt{hom}} \mathtt{STOCTIMED}$

$$\mathtt{NFA} = \mathtt{PROB} = \mathtt{TIMED} = \mathtt{PROBTIMED} \text{ ———— } \mathtt{DELAY} \text{ —— } \mathtt{STOCTIMED}$$

Fig. 4. Theorem 2 - Homomorphic Expressiveness

$$\Psi \xrightarrow{\varphi,\varepsilon,\vartheta} \alpha(\Psi)\mathfrak{S}(\Psi) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathtt{S}(\alpha(\Psi)\mathfrak{T}(\Psi) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathtt{T}(\alpha(\Psi)\mathfrak{Y}(\Psi) \xrightarrow{\vartheta} \Gamma(\alpha(\Psi))$$

Fig. 5. Expressiveness Maps

5 Conclusion

We introduced a framework for understanding the expressiveness of timed and probabilistic automata and observed a sharp separation in expressiveness between the models considered through the isomorphic expressiveness and a split between stochastic and non-stochastic models when using homomorphic expressiveness. As future work, one may also consider measures of trace expressiveness through an isomorphism between traces ϕ, ϕ' and we expect such notion of expressiveness to be weaker than homomorphic expressiveness.

A Appendix A: Isomorphic Expressiveness

Proposition 3. $\texttt{NFA} \sqsubset_{\texttt{iso}} \texttt{TIMED}$

Proof. Let $\mathsf{N} \in \texttt{NFA}$ and construct $\mathsf{T} \in \texttt{TIMED}$ with

$$\mathsf{N} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s_1}, \Gamma, \delta, \mathtt{A}) \text{ and } \mathsf{T} = (\mathtt{S}', \mathtt{s_1}', \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \delta')$$

such that $\mathtt{S}' = \mathtt{S}$, $\mathtt{s_1}' = \mathtt{s_1}$ and $(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{R}, \mathtt{con}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}') \in \delta'$ where $\mathtt{R} = \emptyset$ and $\mathtt{con} = \emptyset$ if and only if $(\mathtt{s}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}') \in \delta$.

To see the inclusion is strict, consider the machine T in Figure 6 running over a time sequence τ with runs of the form

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s_1}, \iota_1) \overset{\gamma_1}{\underset{\tau_1}{\rightarrow}} (\mathtt{s_1}, \iota_2) \overset{\gamma_1}{\underset{\tau_2}{\rightarrow}} \dots (\mathtt{s_1}, \iota_\mathtt{k}) \overset{\gamma_2}{\underset{\tau_\mathtt{k}}{\rightarrow}} (\mathtt{s_2}, \iota_{\mathtt{k}+1}) \overset{\gamma_3}{\underset{\tau_{\mathtt{k}+1}}{\rightarrow}} \dots (\mathtt{s_2}, \iota_\mathtt{r}) \overset{\gamma_4}{\underset{\tau_\mathtt{r}}{\rightarrow}} (\mathtt{s_1}, \iota_2) \dots$$

Suppose there exists $\mathsf{N} \in \texttt{NFA}$ that isomorphically expresses T, with runs of the form

$$\psi' = (\varphi(\mathtt{s_1})) \overset{\vartheta(\gamma_1)}{\rightarrow} (\varphi(\mathtt{s_1})) \overset{\vartheta(\gamma_1)}{\rightarrow} \dots (\varphi(\mathtt{s_1})) \overset{\vartheta(\gamma_2)}{\rightarrow} (\varphi(\mathtt{s_2})) \overset{\vartheta(\gamma_3)}{\rightarrow} \dots (\varphi(\mathtt{s_2})) \overset{\vartheta(\gamma_4)}{\rightarrow} (\varphi(\mathtt{s_1})) \dots$$

Note that in T we have $\mathtt{k}$ γ_1-transitions in $\mathtt{s_1}$ before making a transitions to $\mathtt{s_2}$. Let τ' be another time sequence with each $\tau'_i \in \tau$ be defined as $\tau'_i = \tau_i/2$. In this way we are able to squeeze twice as many γ_1-transitions in a run of T while the runs of N have a constant number of transitions. We have $\mathcal{L}(\psi'_{\lfloor}\mathtt{k}) = \mathcal{H}(\psi'_{\lfloor}\mathtt{k})$ while $\mathcal{L}(\psi_{\lfloor}\mathtt{k}) = \sum_{\forall\tau} \mathcal{H}(\psi_{\lfloor}\mathtt{k})$



Fig. 6. Timed Automaton (one clock)

Proposition 4. $\texttt{NFA} \sqsubset_{\texttt{iso}} \texttt{PROB}$

Proof. Let $\mathsf{N} \in \texttt{NFA}$ and construct $\mathsf{P} \in \texttt{PROB}$ with

$$\mathsf{N} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s_1}, \Gamma, \delta, \mathtt{A}) \text{ and } \mathsf{P} = (\mathtt{S}', \mathtt{s_1}', \Gamma, \mathtt{prob})$$

such that $\mathtt{S}' = \mathtt{S}$, $\mathtt{s_1}' = \mathtt{s_1}$ and $(\mathtt{s}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}', \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}')) \in \mathtt{prob}$ if and only if $(\mathtt{s}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}') \in \delta$ and for all $\mathtt{s}' \in \mathtt{S}' \sum_{\mathtt{s}'' \in \mathtt{S}'} \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}', \mathtt{s}'') = 1$

To see the inclusion is strict, consider the machine $\mathsf{P} \in \texttt{PROB}$ in Figure 7. Suppose there exists a two-state machine $\mathsf{N} \in \texttt{NFA}$ that expresses P isomorphically. $\mathcal{L}(\psi) \neq \mathcal{L}(\psi')$ in the runs

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{s}_1)) \xrightarrow{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_1 \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{s}_1))$$
$$\psi' = (\varphi(\mathtt{s}_1)) \xrightarrow{\gamma_1} (\varphi(\mathtt{s}_1))$$

since $\mathcal{H}(\psi) = 3/4$ and $\mathcal{H}(\psi') = 1/2$



Fig. 7. Probabilistic Automaton

Proposition 5. $\texttt{TIMED} \sqsubset_{\texttt{iso}} \texttt{PROBTIMED}$

Proof. Let $\mathsf{T} \in \texttt{TIMED}$ and construct $\mathsf{A} \in \texttt{PROBTIMED}$

$$\mathsf{T} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \delta) \text{ and } \mathsf{A} = (\mathtt{S}', \mathtt{s}_1{}', \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \mathtt{prob})$$

such that $\mathtt{S}' = \mathtt{S}$, $\mathtt{s}_1{}' = \mathtt{s}_1$ and $(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{R}, \mathtt{con}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}', \mathtt{P}(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}')) \in \mathtt{prob}$ and for all $\mathtt{s}' \in \mathtt{S}' \sum_{\mathtt{s}'' \in \mathtt{S}'} \mathtt{P}(\mathtt{s}', \mathtt{s}'')$ if and only if $(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{R}, \mathtt{con}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}') \in \delta$.

The strictness of the inclusion follows from an argument similar to the one in the proof of Proposition 4.

Proposition 6. $\texttt{PROB} \sqsubset_{\texttt{iso}} \texttt{PROBTIMED}$

Proof. Let $\mathsf{P} \in \texttt{PROBTIMED}$ and construct $\mathsf{A} \in \texttt{PROBTIMED}$ with

$$\mathsf{P} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{prob}) \text{ and } \mathsf{A} = (\mathtt{S}', \mathtt{s}_1{}', \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \mathtt{prob}')$$

such that $\mathtt{S}' = \mathtt{S}$, $\mathtt{s}_1{}' = \mathtt{s}_1$ and $(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{R}, \mathtt{con}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}', \mathtt{P}(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}')) \in \mathtt{prob}'$ with $\mathtt{R} = \emptyset$ and $\mathtt{con} = \emptyset$ if and only if $(\mathtt{s}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}', \mathtt{P}(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}')) \in \mathtt{prob}$.

The strictness of the inclusion follows from an argument similar to the argument in Proposition 3.

Proposition 7. $\texttt{PROBTIMED} \sqsubset_{\texttt{iso}} \texttt{DELAY}$

Proof. Let $\mathsf{A} \in \texttt{PROBTIMED}$ and construct $\mathsf{D} \in \texttt{DELAY}$ with

$$\mathsf{A} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \mathtt{prob}) \text{ and } \mathsf{D} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \mathtt{F}, \Delta, \Pi)_{\mathsf{D}}$$

such that $\mathtt{S}_{\mathsf{D}} \cong_{\varphi} \mathtt{S}_{\mathsf{A}}$, $\Gamma_{\mathsf{D}} = \Gamma_{\mathsf{A}}$, $\mathtt{C}_{\mathsf{D}} \cong_{\alpha} \mathtt{C}_{\mathsf{A}}$ and for any edge $e \in \mathtt{prob}$ with $e = (s_{\mathtt{i}}, s_{\mathtt{j}}, \gamma^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}, \mathtt{con}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}, \mathtt{R}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}, \mathtt{P}(s_{\mathtt{i}}, s_{\mathtt{j}}))$ let $\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}} \in \Delta$ such that

$$\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}(\bar{\mathtt{c}}) = (\mathtt{P}(\varphi(s_{\mathtt{i}}), \varphi(s_{\mathtt{j}})), \alpha(\mathtt{R}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}), \gamma^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}})$$
$$\mathtt{dom}(\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}) = [b, a]^{|\mathtt{C}_{\mathsf{A}}|}$$

with $b_{\mathtt{k}} = \mu\{\iota(\mathtt{c}_{\mathtt{k}}) \rhd \mathtt{con}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}\}$ and $a_{\mathtt{k}} = \xi\{\iota(\mathtt{c}_{\mathtt{k}}) \rhd \mathtt{con}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}\}$.

Now take ψ_{A} with

$$(\mathtt{s}_1, \iota_0, \mathtt{R}_0) \xrightarrow[\tau_0]{\gamma_0} (\mathtt{s}_1, \iota_1, \mathtt{R}_1) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_2, \iota_2, \mathtt{R}_2) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \dots$$

and define ψ_{D} with

$$(\varphi(\mathtt{s}_1), \iota_0) \xrightarrow[\varepsilon(\tau_0)]{\gamma_0} (\varphi(\mathtt{s}_1), \iota_1) \xrightarrow[\varepsilon(\tau_1)]{\gamma_1} (\varphi(\mathtt{s}_2), \iota_2) \xrightarrow[\varepsilon(\tau_2)]{\gamma_2} \dots$$

for identity map ε.

From definition of D, φ is a relabeling, and ε is a time-isomorphism, while it is not hard to see that $\tau_{\mathtt{i}} \in \mathtt{dom}(\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{i}+1})$.

To understand the inclusion is strict, consider the fact that there exist irreducible polynomials over $\mathbb{Q}$, and take the automaton in Figure 8, with $p^1_2 = x + 1/2$, $p^1_3 = 1/2 - x$, $p^2_1 = x + 1/2$, $p^2_3 = 1/2 - x$, $p^3_1 = x + 1/2$, $p^3_2 = 1/2 - x$.

The probability of obtaining a run with $(\gamma_1)^{2\mathtt{k}}$ for arbitrarily big $\mathtt{k}$ is

$$\mathcal{H}((\gamma_1)^{2\mathtt{k}}) = \prod_{\mathtt{m}=1}^{\mathtt{k}} \Big(\int_0^{1/2} (x + 1/2)^{\mathtt{m}} dx \int_0^{1/2} (1/2 - x)^{\mathtt{m}} dx$$

We are therefore aiming towards

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \iota_1) \xrightarrow[\tau_0]{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_3, \iota_2) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_1, \iota_3) \dots \xrightarrow[\tau_{2\mathtt{k}}]{\gamma_1}$$

which is a valid run of the automaton. Suppose there exists a probabilistic timed automaton that can express this automaton with polynomial delay, so one gets an isomorphic run with a time-isomorphism $\tau_{\mathtt{i}} \mapsto \varepsilon(\tau_{\mathtt{i}})$ and a relabeling $\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{i}} \mapsto \varphi(\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{i}})$. Note that by construction $\tau_i \in [0, 1/2]$, so the probabilistic timed automaton cycles between $\varphi(\mathtt{s}_1)$ and $\varphi(\mathtt{s}_2)$ with a maximum time of $1/2$ time units allowed in each state. Let $\mathtt{P}, \mathtt{P}' \in \mathbb{Q}$ describe the probability on the edge from $\varphi(\mathtt{s}_1)$ to $\varphi(\mathtt{s}_2)$ and from $\varphi(\mathtt{s}_2)$ to $\varphi(\mathtt{s}_1)$ respectively:

$$\psi' = (\varphi(\mathtt{s}_1), \iota_1, \mathtt{R}_1) \xrightarrow[\varepsilon(\tau_1)]{\gamma_1} (\varphi(\mathtt{s}_3), \iota_2, \mathtt{R}_2) \dots \xrightarrow[\varepsilon(\tau_{2\mathtt{k}})]{\gamma_1}$$

then, we claim,

$$\mathcal{H}(\psi') = \prod_{\mathtt{m}=1}^{\mathtt{k}} (\mathtt{P} \times \mathtt{P}')^{\mathtt{m}} \neq \mathcal{H}(\psi)$$

. To see this, we consider the product expansion for $\mathtt{k} = 1$ and $\mathtt{k} = 2$:

$$\mathcal{H}(\psi_{\lfloor 2}) = \int_0^{1/2} ((x + 1/2)(1/2 - x))dx = 3/8 \times 1/8 = 1/12$$

$$\mathcal{H}(\psi_{\lfloor 4}) = \int_0^{1/2} ((x + 1/2)^2(1/2 - x)^2)dx = 1/60$$

and we have:

$$\mathcal{H}(\psi'_{\lfloor 2}) = (\mathtt{P} \times \mathtt{P}') \text{ and } \mathcal{H}(\psi'_{\lfloor 4}) = (\mathtt{P} \times \mathtt{P}')^2$$

hence:

$$(\mathtt{P} \times \mathtt{P}') = 1/12 \text{ and } (\mathtt{P} \times \mathtt{P}')^2 = 1/60 \text{ however } (1/12)^2 \neq 1/60$$



Fig. 8. Timed Automaton with Polynomial Delay (left) and Stochastic Timed Automaton (right)

Every function described by a Taylor polynomial is analytic. Every analytic function is measurable. Since the terms in a Taylor polynomial are countable, there exist non-analytic measurable functions. Hence the following result.

Proposition 8. $\mathtt{DELAY} \sqsubset_{\mathtt{iso}} \mathtt{STOCTIMED}$

Proof. The first direction is easy since a TAPD is a restriction of an STA. Let $\mathsf{D} \in \mathtt{DELAY}$ and construct $\mathsf{S} \in \mathtt{DELAY}$ with

$$\mathsf{D} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \mathtt{F}, \Delta, \Pi)_{\mathsf{D}} \text{ and } \mathsf{S} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \mathtt{F}, \Delta)_{\mathsf{S}}$$

such that $\mathtt{S}_{\mathsf{S}} = \mathtt{S}_{\mathsf{D}}, \mathtt{s}_{1\mathsf{S}} = \mathtt{s}_{1\mathsf{D}}, \Gamma_{\mathsf{S}} = \Gamma_{\mathsf{D}}, \mathtt{C}_{\mathsf{S}} = \mathtt{C}_{\mathsf{D}}, \mathtt{F}_{\mathsf{S}} = \mathtt{F}_{\mathsf{D}}$ with $\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}\mathsf{S}} = \frac{|\mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}\mathsf{D}}|}{\sum_{\mathtt{k}=1}^{\mathtt{m}} |\mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{k}\mathsf{D}}|}$

To see the inclusion is strict, consider the STA in Figure 8, with transitions determined by the exponential function $\mathtt{e}$. Since the exponential function does not admit a finite Taylor representation, it follows the machine cannot be expressed by a TAPD. To be precise, consider a run ψ of length 1 that starts in $\mathtt{s}_1$ and ends in $\mathtt{s}_2$. $\mathcal{H}(\psi) = \int_{\mathtt{x}=0}^{1} \mathtt{e}(\mathtt{x})d\mathtt{x} = \mathtt{e} - 1$ which is irrational. We see there can be no run of length 1 of a TAPD that expresses ψ.

These propositions make up the proof of Theorem 1. Our results yield the inclusions depicted in Figure 3.

B Appendix B: Homomorphic Expressiveness

Proposition 9. $\mathtt{NFA} =_{\mathtt{hom}} \mathtt{TIMED}$

Proof. Let $\mathsf{N} \in \mathtt{NFA}$ and construct $\mathsf{T} \in \mathtt{TIMED}$ with

$$\mathsf{N} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \delta, \mathtt{A}) \text{ and } \mathsf{T} = (\mathtt{S}', \mathtt{s}_1{}', \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \delta')$$

such that $\mathtt{S}' = \mathtt{S}$, $\mathtt{s}_1{}' = \mathtt{s}_1$ and $(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{R}, \mathtt{con}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}') \in \delta'$ where $\mathtt{R} = \emptyset$ and $\mathtt{con} = \emptyset$ if and only if $(\mathtt{s}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}') \in \delta$. T expresses D since it is obtained from D by ignoring timing information and it does so under isomorphic expressiveness, as in Proposition 3.

Now let $\mathsf{T} \in \mathtt{TIMED}$ and let N be its region automaton, which is a finite state machine as shown in [1], with states having the form $(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{z})$ where $\mathtt{s}$ is a state of T and $\mathtt{z}$ is a clock region. Assign weights $\mathtt{w}$ to each action $\gamma \in \Gamma$ on each edge of T. The homomorphism is then intuitive: $(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{z}) \mapsto \mathtt{s}$. Alur and Dill then prove that $(\mathtt{s}', \mathtt{z}')$ is reachable from $(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{z})$ in N for some $\mathtt{z}, \mathtt{z}'$ if and only if $\mathtt{s}'$ is reachable from $\mathtt{s}$ in T. Assign weights $\mathtt{t}$ to actions of N inductively: if $\mathtt{s}'$ is reachable from $\mathtt{s}$ through only one edge $e = (\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{R}, \mathtt{con}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}')$ and there exist $\mathtt{k}$ regions $\mathtt{z}_1, \mathtt{z}_2 \ldots \mathtt{z}_\mathtt{k}$ such that $(\mathtt{s}', \mathtt{z}_\mathtt{i})$ are states of N, then assign to γ the weight $\mathtt{t} = \mathtt{w}/\mathtt{k}$, where $\mathtt{w}$ is the weight of γ in e. Now suppose there is a sequence $e_\mathtt{i}$ of $\mathtt{j} - 1$ edges between $\mathtt{s}$ and $\mathtt{s}'$, then assign to each edge $\mathtt{j}$ between $\mathtt{s}'$ and any next state $\mathtt{s}''$ the weight $\mathtt{t} = \mathtt{w}/\mathtt{m}$ where $\mathtt{w}$ is the weight of the corresponding edge in T and $\mathtt{m}$ is, as in the base case, the multiplicity of regions that satisfy the constraint on the $\mathtt{j}$'th edge.

We use this construction and show by induction on length of runs that the measure assigned to a run of T is the same as the measure of the run obtained under this homomorphism. For the base case, suppose the length of ψ of N is $\mathtt{k} = 1$, and suppose the length of the homomorphic run ψ' of T is $\mathtt{j}$, we have $\mathcal{H}(\psi) = \mathtt{j} \times \mathcal{H}(\psi') = \mathtt{j} \times \mathcal{H}(\psi)/\mathtt{j}$. Inductively, consider a ψ length of $\mathtt{k} > 1$ size, then by definition $\mathcal{H}(\psi) = \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{head}(\psi), \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{tail}(\psi)))$ and the case of run length $\mathtt{k}$ reduces to run length $\mathtt{k} - 1$.

Proposition 10. $\mathtt{NFA} =_{\mathtt{hom}} \mathtt{PROB}$

Proof. Let $\mathsf{N} \in \mathtt{NFA}$ and construct $\mathsf{P} \in \mathtt{PROB}$ with

$$\mathsf{D} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \delta, \mathtt{A}) \text{ and } \mathsf{P} = (\mathtt{S}', \mathtt{s}_1{}', \Gamma, \mathtt{prob})$$

such that $\mathtt{S}' = \mathtt{S}$, $\mathtt{s}_1{}' = \mathtt{s}_1$ and $(\mathtt{s}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}', \mathtt{P}(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}')) \in \mathtt{prob}$ and for all $\mathtt{s}' \in \mathtt{S}' \sum_{\mathtt{s}'' \in \mathtt{S}'} \mathtt{P}(\mathtt{s}', \mathtt{s}'')$ if and only if $(\mathtt{s}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}') \in \delta$, as in Proposition 4.

For the other direction, suppose we have $\mathsf{P} \in \mathtt{PROB}$, and obtain $\mathsf{N} \in \mathtt{NFA}$ as follows. Let $\mathtt{k}$ be a g.c.d. for the probabilities on the edges of P and for any edge $(\mathtt{s}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}', \mathtt{P}(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}'))$ of P construct a family of edges of N of cardinality $\mathtt{j}$ of the form $(\mathtt{s}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}'_{\mathtt{i}})$, where $\mathtt{j} = \mathtt{P}(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}')/\mathtt{k}$. We thus obtain a finite state machine that expresses the probabilistic machine. As in the proof of Proposition 9, the homomorphism is intuitive.

This concludes our proof.

Proposition 11. $\mathtt{TIMED} =_{\mathtt{hom}} \mathtt{PROBTIMED}$

Proof. Let $\mathsf{T} \in \mathtt{TIMED}$ and construct $\mathsf{A} \in \mathtt{PROBTIMED}$ with

$$\mathsf{T} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \delta) \text{ and } \mathsf{A} = (\mathtt{S}', \mathtt{s}_1{}', \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \mathtt{prob})$$

such that $\mathtt{S}' = \mathtt{S}$, $\mathtt{s}_1{}' = \mathtt{s}_1$ and $(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{R}, \mathtt{con}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}', \mathtt{P}(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}')) \in \mathtt{prob}$ and for all $\mathtt{s}' \in \mathtt{S}' \sum_{\mathtt{s}'' \in \mathtt{S}'} \mathtt{P}(\mathtt{s}', \mathtt{s}'')$ if and only if $(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{R}, \mathtt{con}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}') \in \delta$.

The other direction is similar to the construction of the proof of Proposition 10, one obtains from a probabilistic timed machine A a non-probabilistic timed machine T by adding as many states as required by the probabilistic transition relation of A.

Proposition 12. $\mathtt{PROB} =_{\mathtt{hom}} \mathtt{PROBTIMED}$

Proof. Follows from Proposition 10, Proposition 11 and Proposition 9 by transitivity.

Proposition 13. $\mathtt{PROBTIMED} \sqsubset_{\mathtt{hom}} \mathtt{DELAY}$

Proof. The argument is analogous to the proof of Proposition 7 and to understand the inclusion is strict consider the automaton in Figure 8, with $p_2^1 = x+1/2$, $p_3^1 = 1/2 - x$, $p_1^2 = x + 1/2$, $p_3^2 = 1/2 - x$, $p_1^3 = x + 1/2$, $p_2^3 = 1/2 - x$.

The probability of obtaining a run with $(\gamma_1)^{2\mathtt{k}}$ for arbitrarily big $\mathtt{k}$ is

$$\mathcal{H}((\gamma_1)^{2\mathtt{k}}) = \int_0^{1/2} \prod_{\mathtt{m}=1}^{\mathtt{k}} ((x + 1/2)(1/2 - x))dx$$

Suppose machine $\mathsf{A} \in \mathtt{PROBTIMED}$ can homomorphically express machine $\mathsf{D} \in \mathtt{DELAY}$, we let the run extend as long as $\mathtt{k} = |\mathtt{S}|^2 + 1$ where $|\mathtt{S}|$ is the set of states of A and it is provable by induction on $\mathtt{k}$ that no probability assignment to the $\mathtt{k}$ possible edges of A can yield:

$$\mathcal{H}((\gamma_1)^{2(|\mathtt{S}|^2+1)}) = P_1 \times P_2 \times \ldots P_{|\mathtt{S}|^2}$$

Proposition 14. $\texttt{DELAY} \sqsubset_{\texttt{hom}} \texttt{STOCTIMED}$

Proof. Analogous to proof of Proposition 8

These propositions make up the proof of Theorem 2. Our results yield the inclusions depicted in Figure 4.

References

1. Rajeev Alur and David L. Dill, *A Theory of Timed Automata*, Theoretical Computer Science, 126, 183–235 1994.
2. Nicolas Basset and Eugene Asarin, *Thin and Thick Timed Regular Languages*, Formal Modeling and Analysis of Timed Systems: 9th International Conference, FORMATS 2011, Aalborg, Denmark, September 21-23, 2011. Proceedings 113–128, 2011.
3. Nathalie Bertrand and Patricia Bouyer and Thomas Brihaye and Quentin Menet and Christel Baier and Marcus Groesser and Marcin Jurdzinski, *Stochastic Timed Automata*, Logical Methods in Computer Science, Volume 10, Issue 4, 2014.
4. Patricia Bouyer and François Laroussinie and Pierre-Alain Reynier, *Diagonal constraints in timed automata: Forward analysis of timed systems*, International Conference on Formal Modeling and Analysis of Timed Systems, 112–126, 2005.
5. Geoffrey Grimmett and David Stirzaker, *Probability and random processes*, Addison Wesley, Massachusetts, Oxford University Press, 2001.
6. Arnd Hartmanns, *Model-checking and simulation for Stochastic Timed Systems*, Formal Methods for Components and Objects: 9th International Symposium, FMCO 2010, Graz, Austria, November 29 - December 1, 2010. Revised Papers, 372–391, 2012.
7. Kwiatkowska, Marta and Norman, Gethin and Sproston, Jeremy and Wang, Fuzhi, *Symbolic model checking for Probabilistic Timed Automata*, Formal Techniques, Modelling and Analysis of Timed and Fault-Tolerant Systems: Joint International Conferences on Formal Modeling and Analysis of Timed Systmes, FORMATS 2004, and Formal Techniques in Real-Time and Fault -Tolerant Systems, FTRTFT 2004, Grenoble, France, September 22-24, 2004. Proceedings, 293–308, 2004.
8. Jan JMM Rutten and Marta Kwiatkowska and Gethin Norman and David Parker, *Mathematical techniques for analyzing concurrent and probabilistic systems*, American Mathematical Society, 2004.
9. Mariëlle Stoelinga, *An introduction to probabilistic automata*, Bulletin of the European Association for Theoretical Computer Science, 176–198, 2002.